



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,499	11/05/2003	Shinji Tai	245062US	6280
22850	7590	03/14/2006		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1713

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/700,499	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	<b>Art Unit</b> 1713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/680,966.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                                     | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>110503 &amp; 020304</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 12/28/2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "the Examiner has not set forth with any specificity the other products asserted as produced by product molding of the polymer blend of the claims of Group 1". This is not found persuasive because the blend can be thermoformed into products such as films, without any co-injection molding and without forming a perform with a polyester.

Applicant also traverses on the ground(s) that "thousands of U.S. patents have issued in which many more than two subclasses have been searched and the Patent and Trademark Office cannot reasonably assert that a burden exists in searching only two subclasses". This is also not found persuasive as it is not relevant how many different subclasses must be searched. The additional burden in searching both inventions, in this case, is from the fact that the search for the process of group II is not required in the search for the product of group I. The search for the limitations in the process of Group II would represent an undue burden in searching for the blend of group I.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Art Unit: 1713

2. Claims 18-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR

1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 14-17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Negi et al. (JP 63264656).

In the abstract, Negi et al. teach a polymer blend/mix comprising two ethylene-vinyl alcohol copolymers B1 and B2, wherein said mixture of B1 and B2 exhibits at least two endothermic peaks in its differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) and satisfies the following:

$$30/70 \leq \text{WBI/WB2} \leq 94/6$$

$$25 \leq \text{ETB1} \leq 40$$

$$96 \leq \text{SDB1}$$

$$45 \leq \text{ETB2} \leq 60$$

Art Unit: 1713

$96 \leq \text{SDB2}$

$5 \leq \text{ETB2} - \text{ETB1}$ ,

wherein the melt index ratio is from 0.05 to 20.

Thus, as the ranges overlap with these of the present claims, the requirements for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are met.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Negi et al. (JP 01204736 or JP 63230757), and under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata et al. (USPN 5972447) or Tai et al. (USPN 6395358).

Each of Negi et al. (see the abstracts), Hata et al. (col. 4, lines 41-46 and col. 5, lines 4-10 and 56-65) and Tai et al. (col. 3, line 50 to col. 4, line 16 and col. 13, lines 19-63) individually teach polymer blends comprising two different ethylene-vinyl alcohol copolymers, wherein one of the copolymers satisfies all the claimed requirements for applicant copolymer B1 and the other satisfies all the claimed requirements for applicant's copolymer B2.

Art Unit: 1713

While Negi et al., Hata et al. or Tai et al. may not have performed one more tests for one or more of the properties claimed by applicant, it is reasonable that the EVOH copolymer blends of Negi et al., Hata et al. or Tai et al. would possess the presently claimed properties since their composition are essentially the same as the claimed composition and the USPTO does not have at its disposal the tools or facilities deemed necessary to make physical determinations of the sort. In any event, an otherwise old composition is not patentable regardless of any new or unexpected properties. In re Fitzgerald et al , 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112 - § 2112.02.

Even if assuming that the prior art references do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 102, it would still have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to arrive at the same inventive composition because the disclosure of the inventive subject matter appears within the generic disclosure of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim whose telephone number is (571) 272-1099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**KELECHI C. EGWIM PH.D.**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

KCE

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'K' followed by a series of loops and a large oval at the bottom.